

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. No claims have been canceled, added or amended. Applicants offer the following arguments in support of the allowability of the claims.

Rejection under 35 USC 102(b)

The Examiner rejects claims 1-19 as anticipated by Wang et al. USP 6,177,026 B1. Applicants traverse the rejection and respectfully request the withdrawal thereof.

The present invention is directed to a metal polish composition comprising a chelate resin particle and an inorganic particle as defined by the broadest claim 1. The chelate resin particle used in the present invention is a resin having polydentate ligand having a plurality of coordinated atoms forming a complex with a metal. The chelate resin may have an ammonium salt as a counter ion of a functional group, but is not an ammonium salt itself.

Wang '026 is directed to a chemical mechanical polishing composition that contains a heterogeneous solid metal oxide catalyst and an oxidizing agent. The abrasive used in Wang '026 is a metal oxide abrasive, such as alumina, titania, zirconia, germania, silica, ceria and mixtures thereof. See column 7, lines 7-13.

The Examiner contends that Wang '026 discloses ammonium salts, which are the same as chelate resin particles in the present invention. Applicants respectfully disagree. At column 9, lines 34-37 Wang '026 discloses polishing slurry additives. These additives are disclosed to improve or enhance the polishing rate. Ammonium salt is one of the additives disclosed.

Applicants submit that even if a metal oxide abrasive is used together with polishing slurry additives, such as the ammonium salt disclosed in Wang '026, this is distinguished from the chelate resin of the present invention.

See, for example, Comparative Examples 2, 5, 7 and 9 in the present specification. In these comparative examples, colloidal silica, which is a metal oxide abrasive disclosed in Wang '026, is used with an oxidizer or polish accelerator. The results demonstrate that the comparative examples fail to produce a sufficient polishing rate.

Moreover, the Examiner contends that EDTA is the same as the chelate resin of the present invention. Applicants respectfully disagree. The chelate resin used in the present invention is not an organic acid. See Comparative Examples 8 and 11 in the specification, where glycine of an organic amino acid is used instead of the chelate resin of the present invention. These comparative examples failed to produce the

excellent polishing rate as compared to the examples that represent the present invention.

Inasmuch as Wang '026 fails to disclose each and every element of the present invention, Applicants submit that the present invention is not anticipated and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

As Applicants have addressed and overcome all rejections in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) respectfully petition(s) for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of \$110.00 is attached hereto.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Kecia Reynolds (Reg. No. 47,021) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.


If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees


required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By  #32868

 Raymond C. Stewart, #21,066


RCS/KJR/jao
2185-0621P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

(Rev. 02/12/2004)